Case 3:06-cv-05130-FDB Docume	ent 15 Filed 06/29/06 Page 1 of 2
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
WESTERN DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
AT TACOMA	
RONALD BASKETT,	
Plaintiff,	
v.	Case No. C06-5130FDB
STATE OF WASHINGTON et al.,	
Defendants,	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
2 010.1 <b></b>	NOTED FOR:
	JULY 21st, 2006
This 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Civil Rights has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to	
Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Magistrates' Rules MJR 1, MJR 3, and MJR 4.	
This action was filed in March of 2006. (Dkt. # 1). Plaintiff alleges he was unlawfully denied a transfer to	
work camp, that the amount of funds in his account is improper, and that he is not being properly medicated.	
Plaintiff failed to connect any allegation with a named defendant. Further, he has no liberty interest in transfer	
to any given facility. Hewitt v. Helms, 459 U.S. 460 (1983). The court ordered plaintiff to file an amended	
complaint and he has not done so. (Dkt. # 10). The court specifically warned plaintiff:	
If an amended complaint is not timely filed, or if plaintiff fails to adequately correct the deficiencies identified in this Order, the Court will recommend dismissal of this action as	

frivolous. (Dkt. # 10).

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION Page - 1

## Case 3:06-cv-05130-FDB Document 15 Filed 06/29/06 Page 2 of 2

Plaintiff has not complied with the court's order to amend and has instead filed "motions for clarification" in which he argues he has a liberty interest in proceeding to work camp.

The court recommends the action be **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** for the reasons stated in the order to amend and for failure to comply with a court order. (Dkt. # 10). A proposed order accompanies this Report and Recommendation. This dismissal will count as a strike under 28 U.S.C. 1915 (g).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal rules of Civil Procedure, the parties shall have ten (10) days from service of this Report to file written objections. *See also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. Failure to file objections will result in a waiver of those objections for purposes of appeal. <u>Thomas v. Arn</u>, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Accommodating the time limit imposed by Rule 72(b), the clerk is directed to set the matter for consideration on **July 14<sup>th</sup>**, **2006**, as noted in the caption.

DATED this 29<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2006.

<u>/S/ J. Kelley Arnold</u>
J. Kelley Arnold
United States Magistrate Judge